arXiv:1609.05472v2 [cs.CC] 20 Nov 2016

Frameworks for Solving Turing Kernel Lower Bound Problem and Finding Natural Candidate Problems in NP-intermediate

Weidong Luo*

Abstract

Kernelization is a significant topic in parameterized complexity. Turing kernelization is a general form of kernelization. In the aspect of kernelization, an impressive hardness theory has been established [Bodlaender etc. (ICALP 2008, JCSS2009), Fortnow and Santhanam (STOC 2008, JCSS 2011), Dell and van Melkebeek (STOC 2010, J. ACM 2014), Drucker (FOCS 2012, SIAM J. Comput. 2015)] based on the assumption that polynomial hierarchy will not collapse, and this hardness theory can obtain lower bounds of kernel size. Unfortunately, this framework is not fit for Turing kernelization. Moreover, so far, there is no tool which can be applied to obtain Turing kernel lower bound for any FPT problem modulo any reasonable complexity hypothesis. Thus, constructing a framework for lower bounds of Turing kernels of FPT problems has received much attention from the parameterized complexity community, and this has been proposed as an open problem in different occasions [Fernau etc. (STACS 2009), Misra etc. (Discrete Optimization 2011), Kratsch (Bulletin of the EATCS 2014), Cygan etc. (Dagstuhl Seminars on kernels 2014)].

Ladner [J. ACM 1975] proved that if P $\neq$ NP, then there exist infinitely many NP-intermediate problems. However, the NP-intermediate problem constructed by Ladner is artificial. Thus, finding natural NP-intermediate problems under the assumption of P $\neq$ NP interests theorists, and it has been a longstanding open problem in computational complexity community.

This paper builds a new bridge between parameterized complexity and classic computational complexity. By using this new connection, some frameworks can be constructed. Based on the assumption that the polynomial hierarchy and the exponential hierarchy will not collapse, these frameworks have three main applications. Firstly, these frameworks can be used to obtain Turing kernel lower bounds of some important FPT problems, thus solving the first open problem. Secondly, these frameworks can also be used to obtain better kernel lower bounds for these problems. Thirdly, these frameworks can be used to figure out a large number of natural problems in NP-intermediate, thus making some contributions to the second open problem.

*Central South University (My Alma Mater), Changsha, P.R. China. E-mail addresses: luoweidong@csu.edu.cn or weidong.luo@yahoo.com

1 Introduction

Parameterized complexity extends classical complexity theory by considering not only the input length but also one or more additional parameters like solution size or structural measures like treewidth. A parameterized problem is a language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$, where Σ is an alphabet with two or more symbols, and the second component is called the parameter of the problem. Kernelization is a well-known and important topic in parameterized complexity [19, 28, 37]. It is a theoretical formalization of efficient preprocessing to deal with hard languages. The polynomial time preprocessing, which is a kernelization, is used to shrink the size of instance and output an equivalent instance, and the output of the preprocessing is called kernel. Another significant topic in parameterized complexity is fixed-parameter tractable. A parameterized language L is fixed-parameter tractable if there exists an algorithm to decide whether $(x, k) \in L$ in time $f(k)|x|^{O(1)}$, where f is an arbitrary function depending only on k, and the corresponding complexity class is called FPT. There is an important connection between kernelizaiton and FPT, that is, a problem has kernel if and only if the problem is in FPT.

Unless otherwise stated, we will use following definition in this paper. Functions $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ are nondecreasing. F and T are classes of functions.

Definition 1.1 *(Kernelization) A kernelization for a parameterized language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a polynomial-time Turing machine M that given any instance (x, k) returns an instance (x', k') such that $(x, k) \in L$ if and only if $(x', k') \in L$ and with $|x'|, k' \leqslant f(k)$. We also call the kernelization as f-sized kernelization.*

We say L has an F-sized kernelization if L has an f-sized kernelization for some $f \in F$. For example, if $f(k)$ is polynomially (linearly) bounded in k, then M is a polynomial (linearly) kernelization and we say the language L has a polynomial (linearly) kernel.

Kernelization requires that the input and output instances belong to the same language. Without this requirement, the concept of kernelization transforms into the concept of compression.

Definition 1.2 *(Compression) A compression for a parameterized language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a polynomial-time Turing machine M that given any instance (x, k) returns an instance x' such that $(x, k) \in L$ if and only if $x' \in Q$ (Q is a language) and with $|x'| \leq 2f(k)$. We also call the compression as f-sized compression.*

The way we define F-sized kernelization can be also used to define F-sized compression. Compression is a general type of kernelization. In some languages, we can probably shrink the instances into smaller size with compression rather than kernelization. For example, Wahlström [74] proved that K-cycle problem has a $|K|^3$-sized compression, but a polynomial kernel has not been found so far.

As more and more techniques for kernelization were found. People realized that it was hard for some problems, such as k-path problem, which asks whether a graph has a simple path of length k, to obtain small kernels, such as polynomial kernel, by using existing techniques. Thus, to figure out why these problems are so hard to get small kernels, researchers proposed an impressive hardness theory to prove lower bounds for kernel size. In their paper [6], Bodlaender

etc. firstly raised two classes of problems. Then, they proved that the problems in one class (including k-path) have no polynomial kernels, unless or(SAT) can compress, and that the problems in another class have no polynomial kernels, unless and(SAT) can compress. Fortnow and Santhanam [35] proved that or(SAT) can not be compressed, unless co-NP $\subseteq$ NP/poly and the polynomial hierarchy collapse. However, and(SAT) had remained an open problem for five years until it was settled by Drucker [29], based on the assumption that there is no nonuniform, statistical zero-knowledge proofs for NP languages, which is a weaker one compared with co-NP $\not\subseteq$ NP/poly. Another insightful work of kernel lower bounds is attributed to Dell and van Melkebeek [26]. They gave a framework for proving kernel lower bounds for problems that do admit some polynomial kernelization. For example, they showed that d-SAT has no $O(n^{d-\epsilon})$ kernel unless co-NP $\subseteq$ NP/poly and polynomial hierarchy collapse. Dell and Marx [25], Hermelin and Wu [42] and Bodlaender etc. [7] also made contributions to the hardness theory. Since then, a large amount of researches have been conducted to solve various concrete problems by employing these frameworks [8, 17, 20, 21, 27, 38, 42, 44, 46, 47, 52, 54, 55, 56]. In fact, all of the kernelization lower bound frameworks mentioned above are also fit for compression lower bound. Compression (kernelization) lower bound also means that the smallest size of the output instance can be obtained by compression (kernelization).

However, there are some relaxed notions of kernelization (including Turing kernelization) whose lower bound are not ruled out by any existing techniques, and these relaxed notions had been proposed [30, 37] before the kernelization lower bound framework was raised.

The relaxed notions allow the kernelization algorithm to output many small independent instances. For example, Fernau etc. [34] found the first problem, namely leaf out-tree(k), which has no polynomial kernel unless co-NP $\subseteq$ NP/poly. However, they constructed a polynomial time algorithm for the problem whose input is an instance of leaf out-tree(k), whose output is n independent kernels of $O(k^3)$-sized, and where the input is a yes instance if and only if at least one output instance is yes instance (n is the vertices number of the input instance and k is the parameter). Because the status of the input instance is equivalent to the disjunction of the status of the output kernels, this polynomial time algorithm is called disjunctive kernelization, which is a type of relaxed notion of kernelization, and the output of this polynomial time algorithm is called disjunctive kernel. With the help of the disjunctive kernelization, we can design an algorithm for the original problem by solving each kernel in turn, and this algorithm only needs to deal with at most n independent $O(k^3)$-sized kernels. Therefore, this kind of relaxed kernel is still useful in practice.

According to the definition of disjunctive kernelization, it is easy to understand other relaxed notions of kernelizations, including conjunctive kernelization, truth-table kernelization and Turing kernelization. The most and least powerful of these three relaxed notions are Turing kernelization and conjunctive kernelization, respectively. In this paper, we mainly discuss the most general relaxed notion of kernelization, i.e. the Turing kernelization. The framework which is fit for Turing kernel lower bounds can also be suitable for other types of kernel lower bounds. We recall the definition of Turing kernelization given by [34] below.

Definition 1.3 *(f-oracle for parameterized language) An f-oracle for a parameterized language Q is an oracle that takes as input (x, k) with $|x| \leq f(n)$, $k \leq f(n)$ (n is some integer) and decides whether $(x, k) \in Q$ in constant time.*

Definition 1.4 *(Turing Kernelization) A parameterized language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is said to have an f-sized Turing kernelization if there is a Turing machine which given an input (x, k) together with an $f(k)$-oracle for L decides whether $(x, k) \in L$ in time polynomial in $|x| + k$.*

We say L has an F-sized Turing kernelization if L has an f-sized Turing kernelization for some $f \in F$. Like the way define compression, we define Turing compression in the same way by allowing the oracle queries to be any other languages. We will define these variants below.

Definition 1.5 *(f-oracle for classic language) An f-oracle for a classic language Q is an oracle that takes as input x with $|x| \leq 2f(n)$ (n is some integer) and decides whether $x \in Q$ in constant time.*

Definition 1.6 *(Turing Compression) A parameterized language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is said to have an f-sized Turing compression if there is a Turing machine which given an input (x, k) together with an $f(k)$-oracle for a classic language Q decides whether $(x, k) \in L$ in time polynomial in $|x| + k$.*

We define F-sized Turing compression according to the way we define F-sized Turing kernelization.

Turing kernelization is more powerful than other relaxed notions of kernelizations. It could even adaptively create reduced instances. So far, people have found some problems that have polynomial Turing kernels, but do not have polynomial kernels [2, 7, 34, 45, 70, 73]. Finding framework for lower bounds of Turing kernels has become an important open problem in parameterized complexity community, and it has been proposed as an open problem in different occasions [18, 34, 53, 62]. In particular, during Dagstuhl Seminars on Kernels in 2014, Cygan etc. [62] gave a list of open problems and ranked them according to their importance and possible hardness, and this problem is one of the most important and difficult problems in the list. Unfortunately, Unlike lower bounds of kernels, until now, there is no technique that can deal with lower bounds of Turing kernels (even for truth-table kernels and disjunctive kernels) for any FPT problem modulo any reasonable complexity hypothesis. The positive aspect is that the polynomial conjunctive kernels can be refuted by modifying the framework of the lower bounds of many-one kernels [52]. There are also some other works related to this problem. Hermelin etc. [41] introduced a new complexity hierarchy for parameterized problems named WK/MK-hierarchy. The lowest hardness class in the hierarchy is WK[1]. They found some problems are complete for WK[1], and conjectured that no WK[1]-complete problem admits a polynomial Turing kernelization, because if there exists a polynomial Turing kernelization for a WK[1]-complete problem, then all problems in WK[1] will have polynomial Turing kernelizations. The situations of the WK[k]-complete problems are alike for all $k \geq 2$. Jansen and Marx [48] studied the $\mathcal{F}$-Subgraph Test and $\mathcal{F}$-Packing problems where $\mathcal{F}$ is a class of graphs, and pointed out which classes $\mathcal{F}$ make the two problems tractable in one of the following senses: polynomial-time solvable, admitting a polynomial many-one kernel or admitting a polynomial Turing kernel.

It is well-known that P and NP-complete are both subsets of NP. A natural question is whether there are languages between P and NP-complete.

Definition 1.7 *(NP-intermediate) Under the assumption of NP $\neq$ P, languages that are in class NP but are neither in the class P nor NP-complete are called NP-intermediate.*

If we can find any problem in NP-intermediate without any assumption, then NP $\neq$ P. According to Ladner's Theorem [57], if NP $\neq$ P, then there exist infinitely many NP-intermediate problems. However, the problem constructed by Ladner is artificial, and finding natural NP-intermediate problems under the assumption NP $\neq$ P is a longstanding open problem in computational complexity community.

Graph isomorphism and integer factorization are famous natural candidate NP-intermediate problems. Schöning [71] proved that if graph isomorphism is in NP-complete, then polynomial hierarchy will collapse to the second level. Babai [5] announced a quasipolynomial time algorithm for graph isomorphism, which is a big breakthrough on this problem and also a convincing evidence showing that graph isomorphism is not in NP-complete. Integer factorization is known to be in both NP and co-NP, so the problem in NP or coNP would imply NP = coNP. However, as far as we know, it has no impact on complexity assumption if these two problems are in P.

This example is come from the Stack Exchange. Under the assumption of NEXP $\neq$ EXP. One the one hand, NEXP $\neq$ EXP means NP $\neq$ P, and there is no sparse set in NP-complete based on Mahaney's theorem [59]. On the other hand, a proper padded version of NEXP-complete problem is in NP, but not in P, as that will contradict NEXP $\neq$ EXP. Moreover, the problem is a sparse set. Thus, the proper padded version of NEXP-complete problem must be in NP-intermediate. Although this result is based on a widely believed assumption, the padded versions of problems are not so natural. In addition, the NEXP-complete problems are not proverbial.

There are some natural problems which have been proved in NP-intermediate based on ETH. For example, tournament dominating set problem [61], V-C dimension [28], densest k-subgraph with perfect completeness [9, 31]. Although this type of candidate NP-intermediate problems are very natural, ETH is a very strong assumption.

Our results. In this paper, we build a new bridge between parameterized complexity and structural complexity of computational complexity, and then use this bridge to construct some new frameworks. There are two main ideas in the frameworks. The first, if a parameterized problem is still (NP-)hard when restricting the parameter to a "small" function (such as, logarithmic, polylogarithmic etc.) depending on the instance length, then this problem probably has no small (Turing) compression. The second, if a parameterized problem has a small compression, then we can obtain the constraint version of the parameterized problem by restricting the parameter to a "small" function depending on the instance length, then the constraint version problem probably cannot be a (NP-)hard one.

These frameworks have three main applications based on the assumptions that the polynomial hierarchy and the exponential hierarchy will not collapse.

(1) These frameworks can obtain the Turing compression (kernel) lower bounds of some important FPT problems by taking advantage of the fruitful research results in classic complexity theory. For example, the frameworks prove that edge clique cover has no polynomial Turing compression unless the exponential hierarchy collapses to the second level, and has no linear Turing compression unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses to the second level. Thus, this paper solves an important open problem (which mentioned in abstract) in parameterized

complexity.

(2) These frameworks can also get better compression (kernel) lower bounds for these FPT problems. For example, the frameworks also prove that edge clique cover has no $2^{o(k)}$ compression unless the polynomial hierarchy collapses to the third level (matching the result in [22]), and has no linear compression unless NP = P. Thus, the frameworks are also new ones to deal with many-one compression lower bounds.

(3) These frameworks can find a large number of natural NP-intermediate problems by taking advantage of the fruitful research results in parameterized complexity. For example, the problem of deciding whether $2^{\sqrt{logn}}$ vertices can be deleted from a n-vertices graph G in order to turn it into a forest is in NP-intermediate, unless exponential hierarchy collapses to the third level. In particular, if this problem is in NP-complete then polynomial hierarchy collapses to the third level, and if this problem is in P then NP $\subseteq$ DTIME($n^{O(logn)}$). Thus, the paper makes some contributions to the longstanding open problem (which mentioned in abstract) in classic computational complexity.

Organization. Section 2 gives preliminaries including other definitions that are needed in this paper. Section 3 demonstrates the frameworks for solving (Turing) compression lower bound problem and finding natural candidate problems in NP-intermediate. Section 4 applies these frameworks to concrete problems. Section 5 is conclusion and final remarks.

2 Preliminaries

At first, we define the non-elementary tower function. Let function $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ be the non-elementary tower function, and $p(0, n) = n$, $p(k + 1, n) = 2^{p(k,n)}$. The inverse of p would be the $log^{(k)}$ function, and $log^{(0)}n = n$, $log^{(k+1)}n = log(log^{(k)}n)$. log^*n equals to the least integer k such that $log^{(k)}n \leq 1$. We also use the O or o notations in the non-elementary tower function, for example, $p(1, o(n)) = 2^{o(n)}$, $p(2, O(n)) = 2^{2^{O(n)}}$ etc.

2.1 Notions in Parameterized Complexity

The running time of compression and Turing compression is a polynomial function on input size. We will extend the time complexity from a polynomial function to some function t, in order to get the definitions of t-compression and t-Turing compression.

Definition 2.1 *(t-Compression) A t-compression for a parameterized language $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a $t(n)$-time Turing machine M (n is the size of the input), which given any instance (x, k) returns an instance x' such that $(x, k) \in L$ if and only if $x' \in Q$ (Q is a language) and with $|x'| \leqslant 2f(k)$. We also say that parameterized language L has an f-sized t-compression.*

We say L has an f-sized T-compression if L has an f-sized t-compression for some $t \in T$, L has an F-sized t-compression if L has an f-sized t-compression for some $f \in F$, L has an F-sized T-compression if L has an f-sized t-compression for some $t \in T$ and $f \in F$.

The parameter k is smaller than the instance length $|x|$ in almost all important problems in parameterized complexity. Thus, without loss of generality we assume that $k \leq |x|$. The same as t-compression, we will give a definition of t-Turing compression.

Definition 2.2 *(t-Turing Compression) $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is said to have an f-sized t-Turing compression if there is a Turing machine which given an input (x, k) together with an $f(k)$-oracle for a classic language Q decides whether $(x, k) \in L$ in time $t(n)$, where $n = |x| + k$.*

We define f-sized T-Turing compression, F-sized t-Turing compression and F-sized T-Turing compression similar to those in definition 2.1.

For a parameterized language, the parameter can be any number. If we restrict the parameter to some special function of the instance length, then the parameterized language will turn into a new language. We named this kind of languages constraint parameterized languages.

Definition 2.3 (*Constraint Parameterized Language*) *$L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a parameterized language. For all instance (x, k) of L, if we restrict the parameter k to $f(|x|)$, then we get a constraint parameterized language Q, and $Q = \{(x, f(|x|))|(x, k) \in L\}$. We say that Q is the f-constraint parameterized language of L.*

We say Q is an F-constraint parameterized language of L if Q is an f-constraint parameterized language of L for some $f \in F$. The instances (including yes instance and no instance) of Q have the property that the parameter $k = f(|x|)$. We will not consider the instances whose formats do not satisfy this property (Turing machine is very easy to recognize the incorrect format instances). Thus, we have $\overline{Q} = \{(x, f(|x|))|(x, k) \in \overline{L}\}$, where $\overline{L}$ and $\overline{Q}$ are the complement languages of L and Q, respectively.

In this paper, we only consider that $f(|x|)$ is a constraint number of k, so we have $f(|x|) \leq |x|$ for large enough $|x|$.

Definition 2.4 (*f-Hard Parameterized Language*) *$L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is a parameterized language. If language $Q \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$ is an f-constraint parameterized language of L as well as Q is NP-hard, then we call L f-hard parameterized language.*

We define F-hard parameterized language similar to the definition of the F-constraint parameterized language. F can be various kinds of function classes, such as logarithmic, polylogarithmic, fractional power etc.

2.2 Notions in Classic Computational Complexity

NEXP (EXP) is the set of decision problems that can be solved by a non-deterministic (deterministic) Turing machine using time $2^{n^{O(1)}}$. The exponential hierarchy (sometimes called EXPH) is a hierarchy of complexity classes, which is an exponential time analogue of the well-known polynomial hierarchy (sometimes called PH).

Definition 2.5 *(Exponential Hierarchy) Exponential hierarchy is the union of the language classes Σ_i^{EXP}, where $\Sigma_i^{EXP} = NEXP^{\Sigma_{i-1}^P}$ (languages computable in nondeterministic time 2^{n^c} for some constant c with a Σ_{i-1}^P oracle), and again $\Pi_i^{EXP} = coNEXP^{\Sigma_{i-1}^P}$, $\Delta_i^P = EXP^{\Sigma_{i-1}^P}$.*

It is commonly believed that PH and EXPH will not collapse.

Definition 2.6 *(f-Sparse Set) Set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is f-sparse if $\|\{x \in S||x| = n\}\| \leq f(n)$ for all but finitely many n. We say S is F-sparse if S is f-sparse for some $f \in F$.*

People usually call polynomial-sparse set sparse set. In some papers, people also consider that set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is f-sparse if $\|\{x \in S||x| \leq n\}\| \leq f(n)$ for all n. However, these two kinds of definitions have no difference when set S is (quasi)polynomial-sparse or subexponential-sparse.

Definition 2.7 *(C/F) An advice function is a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \Sigma^*$. Let C be a complexity class and F be a class of advice functions. The class C/F is the collection of all sets A such that for some language $B \in C$ and some $f \in F$, $A = \{x|(x, f(|x|)) \in B\}$.*

Definition 2.8 *(Circuit Families) A $f(n)$-size circuit family is a sequence $\{C_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of Boolean circuit, where C_n has n inputs and a single output, and its size $|C_n| \leq f(n)$ for every n.*

P/poly is a famous language class in computational complexity. And it is well-known that the following three language classes are equal. The first is P/poly, the second the class of languages which have polynomial size circuits, and the third the class of languages which are polynomial time Turing reducible to some sparse set.

2.3 Concrete Parameterized Problems

Next, we will give the definitions of the parameterized problems which will be employed in this paper. All these problems are in FPT.

Definition 2.9 *(Edge Clique Cover) The input is an undirected graph G and a nonnegative integer k, k is the parameter, the problem asks if there exist a set of k subgraphs of G, such that each subgraph is a clique and each edge of G is contained in at least one of these subgraphs.*

Edge clique cover is a NP-complete problem [67]. It is also in PFT [36]. In their paper [21] Cygan etc. proved that it has no polynomial compression unless co-NP $\subseteq$ NP/poly and PH $= \Sigma_3^P$. Then in the paper [22] Cygan etc. improved the lower bound to $2^{o(k)}$ under the same assumption.

Treewidth and pathwidth of a graph are two well-known parameters of structures that measure their similarity to a tree and a path, respectively. They are commonly used as parameters in the parameterized complexity. We use $tw(G)$ and $pw(G)$ to denote the treewidth and the pathwidth of graph G, respectively. Bounded pathwidth is a more restrictive concept compared with bounded treewith. For any graph G, $pw(G) \leq tw(G)$.

Given graph G together with sets $L(v) \in \mathbb{N}$, one for every vertex v, then G is L-colorable if there exists a coloring $c : V(G) \to \mathbb{N}$, which is proper and for every vertex v we have $c(v) \in L(v)$. G is called $\mathcal{C}$-choosable if for any list assignment $L : V(G) \to 2^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $|L(v)| = \mathcal{C}$ for all vertex v in G, G is L-colorable.

Definition 2.10 *($\mathcal{C}$-Choosability) G is a graph and the parameter tw is the treewidth of G, constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$. Deciding whether G is $\mathcal{C}$-choosable.*

For each $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$, $\mathcal{C}$-choosability is Π_2^P-complete problem [40]. And the problem is in FPT when parameterized by treewidth [32].

Definition 2.11 *($\mathcal{C}$-Choosability Deletion) G is a graph and the parameter tw is the treewidth of G, constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$. The problem asks for the minimum number of vertices that need to be deleted to make G $\mathcal{C}$-choosability.*

For each $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$, $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion is Σ_3^P-complete problem [60]. And the problem is in FPT when parameterized by treewidth [60].

For QBF problem, We will introduce its definition from [68]. Quantified Boolean formula (QBF) extends propositional logic by introducing quantifiers over the Boolean domain {0,1}. We write formulas in QBF in prenex normal form $\psi = (Q_1 p_1)(Q_2 p_2)...(Q_i p_i)\psi'$, where the Qs are quantifiers, the ps are propositions, and ψ' is a propositional formula, which we call the matrix. By bounding the number of alternations, QBF can be stratified into classes Σ_i^{QBF} and Π_i^{QBF}, where i is the number of alternations, and a formula is in Σ_i^{QBF} if its outermost quantifier is $\exists$ and contains i alternations and in Π_i^{QBF} if its outermost quantifier is $\forall$ and contains i alternations. It is well-known that Σ_i^{QBF} and Π_i^{QBF} are the most famous Σ_i^P-complete problem and Π_i^P-complete problem, respectively. The treewidth of a QBF formula is defined as the width of the interaction graph of its CNF matrix. The interaction graph is defined with the set of propositions as vertices, and the co-occurrence (in the same clause) relation between propositions as edges.

Definition 2.12 *(Σ_i^{QBF}) Given a Σ_i^{QBF} formula, constant $i \geq 1$, and the parameter tw is the treewidth of the formula. Deciding whether the formula is satisfiable.*

Chen [15] proved that Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth is in FPT.

Definition 2.13 *(Bounded Treewidth QBF_k) Given a QBF formula with bounded treewidth, and the parameter k is the quantifier alternations number. Deciding whether the formula is satisfiable.*

Atserias and Oliva [4] proved that bounded treewidth QBF is PSPACE-complete. Chen [15] proved that bounded treewidth QBF parameterized by the quantifier alternations number is in FPT.

3 The Frameworks

At first we will deduce some lemmas related to the frameworks. Lemma 3.1 points out that compression and Turing compression are general forms of kernelization and Turing kernelization, respectively. Lemma 3.2 and 3.3 present connections between the size of (Turing) kernel of some FPT problem and the density of objective set which can be (Turing) reduced from the FPT problem.

Lemma 3.1 *L is a parameterized language.*
(1) If L has an $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-kernelization, then L has an $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-compression.
(2) If L has an $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-Turing kernelization, then L has an $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-Turing compression.

Proof. According to the definitions, it is easy to understand that compression is a general type of kernelization. In order to simulate an $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-kernelization of L, we just need to restrict the output of $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-compression to the string of L.

For any instance (x, k) of language L. Suppose $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-Turing kernelization for L is a Turing machine M with $f(k)$-oracle for a parameterized language L. Then, whenever M

generates a string (x', k'), asks the $f(k)$-oracle for parameterized language L whether (x', k') in it, and the length of (x', k') is bounded by $|x'| + |k'| \leq f(k) + f(k) = 2f(k)$. Thus, Turing machine M with $f(k)$-oracle for classic language L (unparameterized version) is also an $f(k)$-sized $t(n)$-Turing compression for L. □

Lemma 3.2 *(x, k) is an instance of $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \times \mathbb{N}$. Q is an f-constraint parameterized language of L. Suppose $2g(f(|x|)) \leq |x| + f(|x|)$ for $|x| \geq C$, C is a larger constant. If L has a g-sized t-Turing compression, then Q is Turing reducible to a set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ of density $O(4^{g(f(n))})$ in time $O(nt(n))$ where $n = |x| + f(|x|)$.*

Proof. Suppose M, M_1 are Turing machines, and $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*$ are classic languages. If the input $|x| \leq$C, then it is easy to prove the theorem, for the constant number is hid in the big O notation. In the following proof, we only need to deal with the long length inputs.

That L has a g-sized t-Turing compression means that there exist a Turing machine M_1 together with a $g(k)$-oracle for S_1 which can decide whether $(x, k) \in L$ in time $t(|x| + k)$. Whenever M_1 generates a string, M_1 will ask the $g(k)$-oracle for S_1 whether the string is in it, and the length of the string is bounded by $2g(k)$. For convenience, the Turing machine M_1 together with the $g(k)$-oracle for S_1 can be abbreviated to $M_1^{g(k)-S_1}$.

Now we consider the language Q. Q is an f-constraint parameterized language of L, so we have $Q \subseteq L$ and $\overline{Q} \subseteq \overline{L}$, where $\overline{Q}$ and $\overline{L}$ are complement languages of Q and L, respectively. In this way, language Q can be solved by the machine $M_1^{g(f(|x|))-S_1}$. More precisely, it means that the Turing machine M_1 together with a $g(f(|x|))$-oracle for S_1 can decide whether $(x, f(k)) \in Q$ in time $t(|x| + f(|x|))$. Whenever M_1 generates a string, M_1 will ask the $g(f(|x|))$-oracle for S_1 whether the string is in it, and the length of the string is bounded by $2g(f(|x|))$. Next, we will construct the set S in two steps.

Step1: Running the machine $M_1^{g(f(|x|))-S_1}$ on an input $(x, f(|x|))$ of length n. Assume that set $S_{2,y}^{=n}$ (string y is short for $(x, f(|x|))$) is the collection of the strings, which have the following properties. Firstly, M_1 generates the string, then asks the $g(f(|x|))$-oracle for S_1 whether the string is in it, and the oracle returns yes. We define set $S_2^{=n} = \bigcup_{|y|=n}(S_{2,y}^{=n}) = \{s_{2,1}^n, s_{2,2}^n, ..., s_{2,t_n}^n\}$. Then we have $|s_{2,i}^n| \leq 2g(f(|x|))$ $(i = 1, 2, ..., t_n)$, so the number of elements in set $S_2^{=n}$ is equal to $t_n \leq \Sigma_{i=1}^{2g(f(|x|))} 2^i = 2^{2g(f(|x|))+1}$ (binary code).

Step2: Since $2g(f(|x|)) \leq f(|x|) + |x| = n$ for lager n, creating a class of new sets $S^{=n} = \{s_1^n, s_2^n, ..., s_{t_n}^n\}$, (where $n = C, C+1, C+2...$). s_i^n is a string created by padding $n - |s_{2,i}^n|$ character "1" on the end of the string $s_{2,i}^n$, where "1" is a symbol not occurring in the language. It is easy to know that the number of elements in set $S^{=n}$ is equal to $\|S_2^{=n}\| \leq 2^{2g(f(|x|))+1}$. In addition, f and g are no decreasing functions, so $2^{2g(f(|x|))+1} \leq 2^{2g(f(|x|+f(|x|)))+1} = 2^{2g(f(n))+1}$. Let the set $S = \bigcup_{n \geq C} S^{=n}$. Finally, we have created a set S and $\|S^{=n}\| \leq 2^{2g(f(n))+1}$.

We regard the language Q as a classic language, which means that the input length is equal to the instance length plus the parameter. We will design a Turing machine M with the oracle S to solve Q. For any input string $(x, f(|x|)) \in Q$ $(n = |x| + f(|x|))$, let M simulate M_1, except for the steps before access the oracle. Whenever M_1 generates a string s, and then asks the $g((f(|x|))$-oracle for S_1 whether the string is in it, M will also produce the string s. In addition, M will pad $n - |s|$ character "1" on the end of the string s to obtain a n-bit string s', and then asks the oracle S whether s' in it. Based on the structure of S, M_1 asks the $g((f(|x|))$-oracle for

S_1 for string s and the oracle returns yes if and only if M asks the oracle S for string s' and the oracle returns yes. Thus $M_1^{g(f(|x|))-S_1}$ can be simulated by M with the oracle S. Next, we will analyse the time cost of M. Since the time cost of M_1 is $t(n)$, and the only difference between M and M_1 are the steps before asking the oracle. Each time before M asks the oracle S, it needs to pad at most n bit "1". Assume that N refers to how many times M needs to access the oracle S, then the time complexity for M is $O(nN + t(n)) \leq O(nt(n) + t(n)) = O(nt(n))$. Thus, we prove that Q can also be solved by M with the oracle S. The time complexity of M is $O(nt(n))$, and $\|S^{=n}\| \leq 2^{2g(f(n))+1}$.

Combined with the input $|x| \leq$C, we can prove that if L has a g-sized t-Turing compression, then Q is Turing reducible to a set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ of density $O(4^{g(f(n))})$ in time $O(nt(n))$. □

Lemma 3.3 *L is a parameterized language, and (x, k) is an instance of L. Q is an f-constraint parameterized language of L. Suppose $2g(f(|x|)) \leq |x| + f(|x|)$ for $|x| \geq C$, C is a larger constant. If L has a g-sized t-compression, then Q is many-one reducible to a set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ of density $O(4^{g(f(n))})$ in time $O(nt(n))$ where $n = |x| + f(|x|)$.*

Proof. Similar to lemma 3.2. In fact, the time complexity of the reduction can be bounded by $O(n + t(n))$ with careful analysis. □

3.1 Frameworks for Turing compression (kernelization) lower bound

Lemma 3.4 *(see [49])If every set in NP has polynomial-size family of circuits, then $PH = \Sigma_2^P$.*

This lemma is the well-known Karp-Lipton theorem [49]. Their original proof collapsed PH to Σ_3^P, and Michael Sipser improved it to Σ_2^P in the same paper. After that, there has been a lot of works on the general theme inspired by the Karp-Lipton theorem [3, 10, 50], especially, the Mahaney theorem [59], which will also be used in this paper. One of the improvement on the collapse of PH was proved by Segupta, who pointed out that NP has polynomial-size family of circuits collapses the PH to $S_2^p \subseteq \Sigma_2^P \cap \Pi_2^P$. Moreover, it became a stronger version of Karp-Lipton theorem after Cai [13] proved that $S_2^p \subseteq ZPP^{NP}$. We choose to state the results for classes in Σ_i^P as these classes are well-know.

Another variant of the Karp-Lipton theorem was provided by Buhrman and Homer [12]. They proved that if NP has quasipolynomial-size circuits, then exponential hierarchy collapses to the second level. In their paper [69] Pavan et. al. improved the collapse to S_2^{exp}.

Lemma 3.5 *(see [12]) If any NP-complete problem is reducible to a set S of density $n^{log^k n}$ in time $n^{log^k n}$, for some k, then $EXPH = \Sigma_2^{EXP}$.*

Actually, In their paper [12] Buhrman and Homer did not regard this result as a lemma or theorem. It is included in the proof of theorem 1 of [12].

Lemma 3.6 *Suppose L is an f-hard parameterized language and has a g-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression. If there exists a constant $c > 0$, such that $g(f(n)) \leq log^c n$ for all but finitely many n, then $EXPH = \Sigma_2^{EXP}$.*

Proof. Assume that (x, k) is an instance of L, and NP-hard language Q is an f-constraint parameterized language of L. L has a g-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression, so L has a

g-sized t-Turing compression for some quasipolynomial function t. Q is Turing reducible to a set S of density $O(4^{g(f(n))})$ in time $O(nt(n))$ where $n = |x| + f(|x|)$, according to lemma 3.2. Obviously, both $O(nt(n))$ and $O(4^{g(f(n))})$ are quasipolynomial functions. According to lemma 3.5, EXPH $= \Sigma_2^{EXP}$. □

This lemma gives us a tool to get Turing compression (kernel) lower bounds under the assumption of EXPH $\neq \Sigma_2^{EXP}$. In order to obtain the compression (kernel) lower bounds of FPT languages, we only need to design polynomial-time reduction algorithms for these languages to illustrate that these languages are f-hard parameterized languages. Thus, this tool transforms the lower bound type problem to algorithm design type problem.

Of all the sizes of lower bounds, people pay great attention to the polynomial size. So we will give the polynomial-sized Turing kernel lower bound lemma, which is a special case of lemma 3.6.

Lemma 3.7 *Suppose L is a polylogarithmic-hard parameterized language. If L has a polynomial-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression, then EXPH $= \Sigma_2^{EXP}$.*

Proof. Refer to the lemma 3.6. In this lemma, f is a quasipolynomial function and g is a polynomial function. Thus, there exists a constant $c > 0$, $g(f(n)) \leq log^c n$ for all but finitely many n. □

We can also use other hypotheses to support the lower bounds of Turing kernels, such as that polynomial hierarchy will not collapse. The following lemma will give a tool for proving Turing kernel lower bounds under the assumption of PH $\neq \Sigma_2^P$.

Lemma 3.8 *Suppose L is an f-hard parameterized language and has a g-sized Turing compression. If there exists a constant $c > 0$, such that $g(f(n)) \leq clogn$ for all but finitely many n, then $PH = \Sigma_2^P$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of lemma 3.6. Expect for that the density of set S is $O(4^{g(f(n))}) = poly(n)$ and the time complexity of the Turing reduction is $poly(n)$ in this lemma. Thus, NP is polynomial time Turing reducible to a sparse set, and PH $= \Sigma_2^P$ according to the lemma 3.4. □

3.2 Frameworks for many-one compression (kernelization) lower bound

A set S has subexponential density if for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, $||S_{=n}|| \leq 2^{n^\epsilon}$ for all but finitely many n.

Lemma 3.9 *(see [59]) If NP is polynomial time many-one reducible to a sparse set, then NP = P.*

This is Mahaney's theorem. There has been a lot of works on the variant of this theorem. One direction is to relax the reduction. One of the prominent results in this direction was proved by Ogiwara and Watanabe [66]. They proved that if NP is bounded truth-table reducible to a sparse set, then NP = P. Enlarging the sparse set is another direction in which Lemma 3.10 is one of the considerable results.

Lemma 3.10 *(see [11]) If NP is polynomial time many-one reducible to a subexponential density set, then PH* $= \Sigma_3^P$.

Buhrman and Hitchcock [11] proved that if NP has subexponential density under polynomial-time many-one reduction, then coNP $\subseteq$ NP/poly. Yap [75] proved that if coNP $\subseteq$ NP/poly, then polynomial hierarchy collapses to the third level, and Cai etc. [14] improved the collapse to S_2^{NP}. In fact, the many-one reduction in lemma 3.10 can be generated to conjunctive reduction and query-bounded Turing reduction [11]. Moreover, the following theorems concerning many-one compression (kernel) lower bounds based on the assumption of PH $\neq \Sigma_3^P$ can also be easily extended to conjunctive compression (kernel) lower bounds and query-bounded Turing compression (kernel) lower bounds [53].

Lemma 3.11 *Suppose L is an f-hard parameterized language and has a g-sized compression. If for any constant $\epsilon > 0$, $g(f(n)) \leq n^\epsilon$ for all but finitely many n, then PH* $= \Sigma_3^P$.

Proof. Assume that (x, k) is an instance of L, and NP hard language Q is an f-constraint parameterized language of L. L has a g-sized compression, so L has a g-sized t-compression for some polynomial function t. Q is many-one reducible to a set $S \subseteq \Sigma^*$ of density $O(4^{g(f(n))})$ in time $O(nt(n))$ where $n = |x| + f(|x|)$, according to lemma 3.3. Obviously, $O(nt(n))$ is a polynomial function, and $O(4^{g(f(n))}) \leq 2^{n^\epsilon}$ for all but finitely many n. Thus, Q is polynomial-time many-one reducible to a set S of subexponential density. According to lemma 3.10, PH $= \Sigma_3^P$. □

Lemma 3.12 *Suppose L is an f-hard parameterized language and has a g-sized compression. If there exists a constant $c > 0$, such that $g(f(n)) \leq clogn$ for all but finitely many n, then NP* $= P$.

Proof. Similar to lemma 3.8. It is easy to conclude that NP is polynomial time many-one reducible to a sparse set. Then NP = P according to lemma 3.9. □

3.3 Framework for finding natural candidate NP-intermediate problems

Lemma 3.13 *$f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ is a strictly monotone increasing function. (x, k) is an instance of parameterized language L. Q is an f-constraint parameterized language of L and $f(|x|) \in |x|^{o(1)}$. If L is an $O(|x|^\epsilon)$-hard parameterized language, where constant $\epsilon \in (0.1]$, and L has a polynomial compression, then we have*
(1) If Q is in NP-complete, then PH $= \Sigma_3^P$.
(2) If Q is in P, then $NP \subseteq DTIME((f^{-1}(n))^{O(1)})$, where n is the length of the input of the language in NP.

Proof. (1) If Q is NP-complete, then L is an f-hard parameterized language, and L has a g-sized compression for some polynomial function g. We have $g(f(|x|)) = poly(|x|^{o(1)}) \leq |x|^\epsilon$ for any constant $\epsilon > 0$. Thus, PH $= \Sigma_3^P$ according to lemma 3.11.

(2) Suppose NP-hard language L' is an $O(|x|^\epsilon)$-constraint parameterized language of L. Then L' is an f'-constraint parameterized language of L for some function $f'(|x|) \in O(|x|^\epsilon)$. We will consider an instance $(x, f'(|x|)) \in L' \subseteq L$ in two steps.

Step1: Pad some special characters # on the end of string x to transform the string $(x, f'(|x|)) \in L$ into $(y, f'(|x|)) \in L$, and satisfy $f'(|x|) = f(|y|)$. Thus, string $(y, f'(|x|)) \in Q \subseteq L$ (in fact, string $(y, f'(|x|))$ and string $(y, f(|y|))$ are the same), and the number of the padded characters # is less than $|y| = f^{-1}(f'(|x|))$. The time complexity of the first step is $O(|y|)$.

Step2: Consider the language $(y, f'(|x|)) \in Q$. $Q \in$ P means that we can decide it in polynomial time, so the time complexity to solve Q is $(|y| + f'(|x|))^{O(1)}$.

Finally, summing up the time complexity of the two steps, we can get that L' can be decided in time $(|y| + f'(|x|))^{O(1)} = (f^{-1}(f'(|x|)) + f'(|x|))^{O(1)}$. It is easy to see that $f^{-1}(|x|)$ is a superpolynomial function, so we have $(f^{-1}(f'(|x|)) + f'(|x|))^{O(1)} = (f^{-1}(|x|))^{O(1)}$. L' is NP-hard, so there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that, given a n-sized instance of any language in NP, constructs an equivalent $|x|$-sized instance of L' with $|x| = n^{O(1)}$. Thus, any language with input size n in NP can be solved in time $n^{O(1)} + (f^{-1}(n^{O(1)}))^{O(1)} = (f^{-1}(n))^{O(1)}$. □

4 Applications

This section falls into three parts. The first part and the second part will give Turing compression lower bounds and compression lower bounds of some FPT problems, respectively. The third part will illustrate some natural candidate problems in NP-intermediate.

At first, we need to prove some properties of the FPT problems. These problems include satisfiability for Σ_i^{QBF} formulas parameterized by treewidth, satisfiability for bounded treewidth QBF_k formulas parameterized by quantifier alternations number k, edge clique cover, $\mathcal{C}$-choosability parameterized by treewidth and $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by treewidth.

Lemma 4.1 *The problems mentioned above have following properties. Assume that (x, k) is an instance of each problem.*
(1) Edge clique cover parameterized by clique number is an $O(log|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.
(2) For each constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$, $\mathcal{C}$-choosability parameterized by treewidth is an $O(log|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.
(3) For each constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$, $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by treewidth is an $O(loglog|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.
(4) For each odd constant number $i \geq 3$, Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth is an $O(log^{(i-1)}|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.
(5) There exists a constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 1$ such that QBF_k on inputs of treewidth at most $\mathcal{C}$ parameterized by quantifier alternations number k is a $4log^*|x|$-hard parameterized problem.

Proof. Bounded pathwidth is a more restrictive concept than bounded treewith, so the following results are still right if replacing pathwidth with treewidth.

(1) Cygan, Pilipczuk, and Pilipczuk [22] proved that there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that, given a 3-SAT formula with n variables and m clauses, constructs an equivalent edge clique cover instance (G, k) with $k = O(logn)$ and $|V(G)| = O(n + m)$. Thus, edge clique cover parameterized by clique number is an $O(log|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.

(2) In the proof of the algorithmic lower bound of $\mathcal{C}$-choosability problem [60], one of the underlying results is that $\mathcal{C}$-choosability on inputs of pathwidth bounded by $O(log|x|)$ is NP-hard. More precisely, Holyer [43] proved that edge 3-coloring problem is NP-complete. Marx and Mitsou [60] constructed a polynomial time reduction from edge 3-coloring to (2,3)-choosability problem. Moreover, they proved that if the input instance of the reduction has n vertices then the pathwidth of the output instance is bounded by $O(logn)$. Gutner and Tarsi [40] constructed a polynomial time reduction from (2,3)-choosability to $\mathcal{C}$-choosability. In addition, they proved that the pathwidth $pw(G')$ of the output instance G' of the reduction is linear bounded by the pathwidth $pw(G)$ of the input instance G, that is, $pw(G') = O(pw(G))$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}$-choosability problem parameterized by pathwidth is an $O(log|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.

(3) The same as the $\mathcal{C}$-choosability, in the paper of Marx and Mitsou [60], one of the underlying results is that $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion on inputs of pathwidth bounded by $O(loglog|x|)$ is NP-complete. More precisely, Kratochvíl [51] proved that bipartite list 3-coloring problem is NP-hard. Marx and Mitsou [60] presented a reduction from bipartite list 3-coloring to $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion. Moreover, they proved that if the input instance has n vertices, then the pathwidth of the output instance is bounded by $O(loglogn)$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by pathwidth is an $O(loglog|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.

(4) We can prove that Σ_i^{QBF} problem of treewidth at most $O(log^{(i-1)}|x|)$ is still NP-hard according to Theorem 3.5 and Theorem 4.5 in [68]. Theorem 3.5 in [68] showed that there exists a polynomial time algorithm that, given an instance (T, w, I) of tiling-check problem in NP-complete, constructs a QPTL finite model checking instance $\pi_{w,I} \models \varphi_{T,w}$. In addition, the reduction satisfies

(i) $\pi_{w,I} \models \varphi_{T,w}$ if and only if (T, w, I) have a solution.

(ii) The word model $\pi_{w,I}$ has size polynomial in w.

(iii) The formulas $\varphi_{T,w}$ are in Σ_i^{QPTL} $(i > 2)$ and are small enough so that there exists a constant $c > 0$ where $p(i-1, c|\varphi_{T,w}|)$ is in $poly(w)$.

(ii) and (iii) mean that there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ where $|\varphi_{T,w}| \leq c_1 log^{(i-1)}(|\pi_{w,I}|)$. Thus, the reduction implies that QPTL finite model checking problem is NP-hard when the formulas $\varphi_{T,w}$ are in Σ_i^{QPTL} and $|\varphi_{T,w}| \leq c_1 log^{(i-1)}(|\pi_{w,I}|)$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$.

Theorem 4.5 in [68] proved that there exists a polynomial (precisely, $O(|\varphi||\pi|)$) time algorithm that, given a formula φ in Σ_i^{QPTL} (for odd i) and a finite word model π, constructs a formula $\psi = \varphi_{Q,\pi}$ in Σ_i^{QBF} of size $O(|\varphi||\pi|)$ and pathwidth $|tw| \leq 2|\varphi| - 1$, such that $\pi \models \varphi$ if and only if $\models \psi$.

Since $|\varphi| \leq c_1 log^{(i-1)}(|\pi|)$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$, we have $|tw| \leq 2c_1 log^{(i-1)}(|\pi|) - 1 \leq 2c_1 log^{(i-1)}(|\varphi||\pi|) - 1 = O(log^{(i-1)}(|\psi|))$. So Σ_i^{QBF} is NP-hard when the pathwidth is bounded by $O(log^{(i-1)}(|\psi|))$. Finally, we prove that for each odd constant number $i \geq 3$, Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth is an $O(log^{(i-1)}|x|)$-hard parameterized problem.

(5) In [4], corollary 1 proved that there exists a constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 1$ such that, for every $r \geq 0$, QBF_k on inputs of pathwidth at most $\mathcal{C}$ and $k = r + 4log^* n$ quantifier alternations is NP-hard, where n is the number of variables in the formula. It is clear that $n \leq |x|$, so bounded treewidth QBF_k is NP-hard when the quantifier alternations number is $4log^*|x|$. □

4.1 Turing compression (kernelization) lower bounds for concrete problems

In this part, we will apply the frameworks of Turing compression lower bounds to solving concrete problems which have been mentioned above.

Theorem 4.2 *Unless EXPH = Σ_2^{EXP},*
(1) There is no polynomial-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for edge clique cover.
(2) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$, there is no polynomial-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability parameterized by treewidth.
(3) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$, there is no $2^{O(tw)}$-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by treewidth.
(4) For Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth, there are no $2^{O(tw)}$-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for it when $i = 3$, and no $p(i-2, o(tw))$-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for it when $i = 2c+3$ (constant $c \geq 1$).
(5) There is no $(p(\frac{k}{4}-2,1))^{O(1)}$-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for bounded treewidth QBF_k parameterized by quantifier alternations k.

Proof. Lemma 4.1 proved that edge clique cover and $\mathcal{C}$-choosability (constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$) parameterized by treewidth are both polylogarithmic-hard parameterized problems. Thus, the two problems both have no polynomial-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression unless EXPH = Σ_2^{EXP} according to lemma 3.7.

Lemma 4.1 proved that $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by treewidth is an $O(loglogn)$-hard parameterized problem for each fixed $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$. There exits a function $f(n) \in O(loglogn)$ such that $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion is an f-hard parameterized problem. If there exists a g-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion for some function $g(tw) \in 2^{O(tw)}$, then $g(f(n)) \leq 2^{c_1(c_2 loglogn)} = (logn)^c$ for some constant c_1, c_2 and $c = c_1 + c_2$. Thus, EXPH = Σ_2^{EXP} based on lemma 3.6.

Lemma 4.1 proved that Σ_i^{QBF} is an $O(log^{(i-1)}n)$-hard parameterized problem for each odd number $i \geq 3$. In particular, Σ_3^{QBF} is an $O(loglogn)$-hard parameterized problem. The same as the proof of $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion, Σ_3^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth has no $2^{O(tw)}$-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression. For the case of $i \geq 5$, there exists a function $f(n) \in O(log^{(i-1)}n)$, such that Σ_i^{QBF} is an f-hard parameterized problem. If there exists a g-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for Σ_i^{QBF} for some function $g(tw) \in p(i-2, o(tw))$, then we have $g(f(n)) \leq p(i-2, o(c_1 log^{(i-1)}n))$ for some constant c_1, and it is easy to prove that $p(i-2, o(c_1 log^{(i-1)}n)) \leq log^c n$ for some constant c. In fact, for any $\epsilon > 0$, $p(i-2, o(c_1 log^{(i-1)}n)) \leq log^\epsilon n$. Thus, EXPH = Σ_2^{EXP} according to lemma 3.6.

Lemma 4.1 proved that bounded treewidth QBF_k parameterized by quantifier alternations number k is an f-hard parameterized problem and $f(n) = 4log^* n$. If the problem has a g-sized quasipolynomial-Turing compression for some function $g(k) \in (p(\frac{k}{4}-2,1))^{O(1)}$, then $g(f(n)) \leq (p(\frac{4log^* n}{4}-2,1))^c = (log(p(log^* n - 1, 1)))^c \leq (logn)^c$ for some constant c. Thus, EXPH = Σ_2^{EXP} based on lemma 3.6. □

Theorem 4.3 *Unless PH = Σ_2^P,*
(1) There is no linear-sized Turing compression for edge clique cover.
(2) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$, there is no linear-sized Turing compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability

parameterized by treewidth.
(3) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$, there is no $2^{o(tw)}$-sized Turing compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by treewidth.
(4) For each odd constant number $i \geq 3$, there is no $p(i-2, o(tw))$-sized Turing compression for Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth.
(5) There is no $O(p(\frac{k}{4}-2,1))$-sized Turing compression for bounded treewidth QBF_k parameterized by quantifier alternations k.

PROOF. Refer to the theorem 4.2. The proofs of the two theorems are very similar, except for that this proof will be based on lemma 3.8 instead of lemma 3.6 in the proof of theorem 4.2. □

4.2 Better many-one compression (kernelization) lower bounds for concrete problems

This part will give compression lower bounds for these problems which have been mentioned above. In their paper [22], Cygan etc. have also proved proposition (1) in theorem 4.4, and we can obtain the same result by employing our framework. In their paper [36] Gramm etc. pointed out that there is a $2^{O(k)}$-sized kernel for this problem, so the kernel lower bound of edge clique cover is essentially tight.

Theorem 4.4 *Unless PH $= \Sigma_3^P$,*
(1) (also see [22]) There is no $2^{o(k)}$-sized compression for edge clique cover.
(2) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$, there is no $2^{o(tw)}$-sized compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability parameterized by treewidth.
(3) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$, there is no $2^{2^{o(tw)}}$-sized compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by treewidth.
(4) For each odd constant number $i \geq 3$, there is no $p(i-1, o(tw))$-sized compression for Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth.
(5) There is no $(p(\frac{k}{4}-1,1))^{o(1)}$-sized compression for bounded treewidth QBF_k parameterized by quantifier alternations k.

PROOF. Lemma 4.1 proved that edge clique cover and $\mathcal{C}$-choosability parameterized by treewidth are f-hard parameterized languages for some function $f(n) \in O(logn)$. If these problems have g-sized compression for some function $g(k) \in 2^{o(k)}$, then $g(f(n)) = 2^{o(logn)} \leq 2^{\epsilon logn} = n^{\epsilon}$ for any constant $\epsilon > 0$. Thus PH $= \Sigma_3^P$ according to lemma 3.11. The proof of $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion is similar.

Lemma 4.1 proved that, for each odd number $i \geq 3$, Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth is an f-hard parameterized problem for some function $f(n) \in O(log^{(i-1)}n)$. If the problem has a g-sized compression for some function $g(tw) \in p(i-1, o(tw))$, then we have $g(f(n)) = p(i-1, o(f(n))) = p(i-1, o(log^{(i-1)}n)) \leq n^{\epsilon}$ for any constant $\epsilon > 0$. Thus PH $= \Sigma_3^P$ according to lemma 3.11.

Lemma 4.1 proved that bounded treewidth QBF_k parameterized by quantifier alternations number is an f-hard parameterized problem and $f(n) = 4log^*n$. If the problem has a g-sized compression for some function $g(k) \in (p(\frac{k}{4}-1,1))^{o(1)}$, then $g(f(n)) = (p(\frac{4log^*n}{4}-1,1))^{o(1)} \leq n^{o(1)} \leq n^{\epsilon}$ for any constant ϵ. Thus, PH $= \Sigma_3^P$ according to lemma 3.11. □

Theorem 4.5 *Unless NP = P,*
(1) There is no linear-sized compression for edge clique cover.
(2) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 3$, there is no linear-sized compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability parameterized by treewidth.
(3) For every constant $\mathcal{C} \geq 4$, there is no $2^{o(tw)}$-sized compression for $\mathcal{C}$-choosability deletion parameterized by treewidth.
(4) For each odd constant number $i \geq 3$, there is no $p(i-2, o(tw))$-sized compression for Σ_i^{QBF} parameterized by treewidth.
(5) There is no $O(p(\frac{k}{4}-2, 1))$-sized compression for bounded treewidth QBF_k parameterized by quantifier alternations k.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of theorem 4.3, except for that this proof will be based on lemma 3.12 instead of lemma 3.8 in the proof of theorem 4.3. □

Another meaning of theorem 4.5 is that these problems (except for the bounded treewidth QBF) can be compressed in polynomial time if and only if they can be solved in polynomial time, because NP = P implies PH = P, and all the problems discussed in this theorem are in PH.

4.3 Natural candidate problems in NP-intermediate

In this part, we will use the lemma 3.13 to find out a large number of natural problems in NP-intermediate under the assumption of EXPH $\neq \Sigma_3^{EXP}$. In fact, almost all of the NP-complete parameterized problems which have polynomial kernel will conform to the lemma 3.13.

At first, let us give the kernels size of these problems. Feedback vertex set (FVS) has a $4k^2$ kernel [72]. Minimum fill-in (also known as chordal graph completion and minimum triangulation) has a $2k^2 + 2k$ kernel [65]. Cluster editing has a $2k$ kernel [16]. Clique partition has a k^2 kernel [64]. Max leaf in directed graph and undirected graph has an $O(k^3)$ kernel and an $O(k)$ kernel [23], respectively.

Theorem 4.6 *Given a n-vertex graph G and a constant number $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Unless EXPH $= \Sigma_3^{EXP}$, the following problems are in NP-intermediate,*
(1) (FVS) Whether $2^{log^\epsilon n}$ vertices can be deleted from G in order to turn it into a forest.
(2) (Minimum Fill-In) Whether $2^{log^\epsilon n}$ edges can be added to G in order to turn it into a chordal graph.
(3) (Cluster Editing) Whether we can transform G, by deleting or adding $2^{log^\epsilon n}$ edges, into a graph that consists of a disjoint union of cliques.
(4) (Clique Partition) Whether the edge-set of G can be partitioned into $2^{log^\epsilon n}$ cliques.
(5) ((Directed) Max Leaf) Whether (directed graph) G has a spanning tree with $2^{log^\epsilon n}$ leaves.
More precisely, if these problems are in NP-complete then $PH = \Sigma_3^P$, and if these problems are in P then $NP \subseteq DTIME(m^{polylogm})$, where m is the length of the input of the language in NP.

Proof. Firstly, let us consider the first problem, and we name it $2^{log^\epsilon n}$-constraint FVS.

Suppose function $f(z) = 2^{log^\epsilon z}$, the derivation of f is $f'(z) = \frac{\epsilon f(z)}{z log^{1-\epsilon} z}$, where $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Thus, $f'(z) > 0$ for all $z > 1$ and f is a strictly monotone increasing function. We obtain the inverse

function of f by adding log functions to both sides of the equation, then we have $z = 2^{log^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}(f(z))}$, and $f^{-1}(z) = 2^{log^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}z}$. In addition, constant $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ implies $(f^{-1}(z))^{O(1)} = 2^{O(log^{\frac{1}{\epsilon}}z)} = z^{polylogz}$.

Suppose that (x,k) is an instance of FVS. FVS has an $O(k^2)$ kernel, so there exists a polynomial-time reduction that, given an FVS instance (x,k), constructs a new FVS instance (x',k') with $|x'| = O(k'^c)$ for some constant c. Thus FVS is still NP-hard when the parameter $k' = O(|x'|^{\frac{1}{c}})$. FVS is an $O(n^{\epsilon_1})$-hard parameterized language, where ϵ_1 is some constant and $\epsilon_1 \in (0,1]$.

Since $2^{log^{\epsilon}n} \leq 2^{log^{\epsilon}|x|} = |x|^{\frac{1}{log^{1-\epsilon}|x|}}$,it is clear that $2^{log^{\epsilon}n}$-constraint FVS is a $|x|^{o(1)}$-constraint parameterized language of FVS.

According to lemma 3.13, if $2^{log^{\epsilon}n}$-constraint FVS is in NP-complete then polynomial hierarchy will collapse to Σ_3^P, and if the problem is in P then NP $\subseteq$ DTIME($m^{polylogm}$). On the one hand, PH $= \Sigma_3^P$ implies EXPH $= \Sigma_3^{EXP}$ (padding argument). On the other hand, the Proposition 2 in [12] proved that NP $\subseteq$ DTIME($m^{polylogm}$) implies NEXP = EXP. If NEXP = EXP then EXPH = NEXP [24, 63], it also means EXPH $= \Sigma_3^{EXP}$. Thus, if $2^{log^{\epsilon}n}$-constraint FVS is in NP-intermediate then EXPH $= \Sigma_3^{EXP}$.

The proofs of other problems are similar to the proof of the first problem. □

Besides $f(z) = 2^{log^{\epsilon}z}$, we can also choose other functions which conform to lemma 3.13.

In the function $f(z) = 2^{log^{\epsilon}z}$, ϵ is a constant. We can choose any constant $0 < \epsilon < 1$ for the function. For example, if we choose $\epsilon = 0.5$, then we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.7 *Given a n-vertex graph G. Unless EXPH $= \Sigma_3^{EXP}$, the following problems are in NP-intermediate,*
(1) (FVS) Whether $2^{\sqrt{logn}}$ vertices can be deleted from G in order to turn it into a forest.
(2) (Minimum Fill-In) Whether $2^{\sqrt{logn}}$ edges can be added to G in order to turn it into a chordal graph.
(3) (Cluster Editing) Whether we can transform G, by deleting or adding $2^{\sqrt{logn}}$ edges, into a graph that consists of a disjoint union of cliques.
(4) (Clique Partition) Whether the edge-set of G can be partitioned into $2^{\sqrt{logn}}$ cliques.
(5) ((Directed) Max Leaf) Whether (directed graph) G has a spanning tree with $2^{\sqrt{logn}}$ leaves.
More precisely, if these problems are in NP-complete then PH $= \Sigma_3^P$, and if these problems are in P then NP $\subseteq DTIME(m^{O(logm)})$, where m is the length of the input of the language in NP.

Besides the problems mentioned above, there are many other problems that have similar results, such as, Vertex Cover [28], Disjoint Triangles [33], 3-Hitting Set [1], (Directed) Max Internal Spanning Tree [39, 58] etc.

5 Conclusion and final remarks

This paper found a new connection between parameterized complexity and structural complexity of classic computational complexity. Then, we created some frameworks with this connection. Moreover, These frameworks can not only obtain Turing compression (kernelization) lower bounds of some important FPT problems, but also find a large number of natural candidate NP-intermediate problems.

Similar to the definition of Turing compression (kernelization), we define conondeterministic Turing compression (kernelization) by changing the deterministic Turing machine into the conondeterministic Turing machine. It is not hard to obtain the conondeterministic Turing compression (kernelization) lower bound according to the same methodology in this paper as well as the assumption of coNP $\not\subseteq$ NP/qpoly [69].

We believe that the frameworks could get (Turing) kernel lower bounds of other important problems. Besides, maybe we could obtain other interesting results in parameterized complexity and classic computational complexity by employing the frameworks.

Acknowledgement: First and foremost, the author thanks Jianer Chen for helpful discussions and advice, and Marek Cygan for the helpful e-mail. Besides, the author thanks Zhipeng Tang, Changhui Wang, Jianxin Wang, Guangwei Wu, Chao Xu for a lot of help during research and study. Last but not least, the author thanks Qilong Feng and Feng Shi for the useful reference material.

References

[1] Faisal N. Abu-Khzam. A kernelization algorithm for d-Hitting Set. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 76(7): 524-531 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2009.09.002.

[2] Abhimanyu M. Ambalath, Radheshyam Balasundaram, Chintan Rao H., Venkata Koppula, Neeldhara Misra, Geevarghese Philip, M. S. Ramanujan. On the kernelization complexity of colorful motifs. IPEC 2010: 14-25. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-17493-3_4.

[3] Vikraman Arvind, Johannes Köbler, Uwe Schöning, Rainer Schuler. If NP has polynomial-size circuits, then MA=AM. Theor. Comput. Sci. 137(2): 279-282 (1995).

[4] Albert Atserias, Sergi Oliva. Bounded-width QBF is PSPACE-complete. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 80(7): 1415-1429 (2014). doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2014.04.014.

[5] László Babai. Graph isomorphism in quasipolynomial time [extended abstract]. STOC 2016: 684-697. doi:10.1145/2897518.2897542.

[6] Hans L. Bodlaender, Rodney G. Downey, Michael R. Fellows, Danny Hermelin. On problems without polynomial kernels. J. Comput. Syst. Sci., 75(8):423-434, (2009).

[7] Hans L. Bodlaender, Bart M. P. Jansen, Stefan Kratsch. Kernelization lower bounds by cross-composition. SIAM J. Discrete Math. 28(1): 277-305 (2014).

[8] Hans L. Bodlaender, Stéphan Thomassé, Anders Yeo. Kernel bounds for disjoint cycles and disjoint paths. Theor. Comput. Sci. 412(35): 4570-4578 (2011).

[9] Mark Braverman, Young Kun-Ko, Aviad Rubinstein, Omri Weinstein. ETH hardness for densest-k-subgraph with perfect completeness. CoRR abs/1504.08352 (2015). to appear in SODA'17.

[10] Nader H. Bshouty, Richard Cleve, Ricard Gavaldà, Sampath Kannan, Christino Tamon. Oracles and queries that are sufficient for exact learning. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 52(3): 421-433 (1996). doi:10.1006/jcss.1996.0032.

[11] Harry Buhrman, John M. Hitchcock. NP-hard sets are exponentially dense unless coNP $\subseteq$ NP/poly. IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity 2008: 1-7.

[12] Harry Buhrman, Steven Homer. Superpolynomial circuits, almost sparse oracles, and the exponential hierarchy. FSTTCS 1992: 116-127. doi:10.1007/3-540-56287-7_99.

[13] Jin-yi Cai. $S_2^P \subseteq ZPP^{NP}$. FOCS 2001: 620-629. doi:10.1109/sfcs.2001.959938.

[14] Jin-yi Cai, Venkatesan T. Chakaravarthy, Lane A. Hemaspaandra, Mitsunori Ogihara. Competing provers yield improved Karp-Lipton collapse results. Inf. Comput. 198(1): 1-23 (2005). doi:10.1016/j.ic.2005.01.002.

[15] Hubie Chen. Quantified constraint satisfaction and bounded treewidth. ECAI 2004: 161-165.

[16] Jianer Chen, Jie Meng. A $2k$ kernel for the cluster editing problem. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 78(1): 211-220 (2012). doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2011.04.001.

[17] Yijia Chen, Jörg Flum, Moritz Müller. Lower bounds for kernelizations and other preprocessing procedures. Theory Comput. Syst. 48(4): 803-839 (2011).

[18] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Bart M. P. Jansen, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, Saket Saurabh. Open problems for FPT school 2014. Dagstuhl Seminars or Workshop on Kernels. http://fptschool.mimuw.edu.pl/opl.pdf.

[19] Marek Cygan, Fedor V. Fomin, Łukasz Kowalik, Daniel Lokshtanov, Dániel Marx, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, Saket Saurabh. Parameterized algorithms. Springer 2015, ISBN 978-3-319-21274-6, pp. 3-555. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21275-3.

[20] Marek Cygan, Fabrizio Grandoni, Danny Hermelin. Tight kernel bounds for problems on graphs with small degeneracy. ESA 2013: 361-372.

[21] Marek Cygan, Stefan Kratsch, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, Magnus Wahlström. Clique cover and graph separation: new incompressibility results. TOCT 6(2): 6 (2014). doi:10.1007/978-3-642-31594-7_22.

[22] Marek Cygan, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk. Known algorithms for edge clique cover are probably optimal. SIAM J. Comput. 45(1): 67-83 (2016). doi:10.1137/130947076.

[23] Jean Daligault, Gregory Gutin, Eun Jung Kim, Anders Yeo. FPT algorithms and kernels for the directed k-leaf problem. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 76(2): 144-152 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2009.06.005.

[24] Anuj Dawar, Georg Gottlob, Lauri Hella. Capturing relativized complexity classes without order. Math. Log. Q. 44: 109-122 (1998). doi:10.1002/malq.19980440108.

[25] Holger Dell, Dániel Marx. Kernelization of packing problems. SODA 2012: 68-81. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973099.6.

[26] Holger Dell, Dieter van Melkebeek. Satisfiability allows no nontrivial sparsification unless the polynomial-time hierarchy collapses. J. ACM 61(4): 23:1-23:27 (2014).

[27] Michael Dom, Daniel Lokshtanov, Saket Saurabh. Incompressibility through colors and IDs. ICALP (1) 2009: 378-389. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-02927-1_32.

[28] Rodney G. Downey, Michael R. Fellows. Fundamentals of parametrized complexity. Texts in Computer Science, Springer 2013, ISBN 978-1-4471-5558-4, pp. I-SSS, 3-707. doi:10.1007/978-1-4471-5559-1.

[29] Andrew Drucker. New limits to classical and quantum instance compression. SIAM J. Comput. 44(5): 1443-1479 (2015). doi:10.1137/130927115.

[30] Vladimir Estivill-Castro, Michael R. Fellows, Michael A. Langston, Frances A. Rosamond. FPT is P-time extremal structure I. ACiD 2005: 1-41.

[31] Uriel Feige, Michael Seltser. On the densest k-subgraph problem. Citeseer, 1997.

[32] Michael R. Fellows, Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Frances Rosamond, Saket Saurabh, Stefan Szeider, Carsten Thomassen. On the complexity of some colorful problems parameterized by treewidth. Information and Computation, 209(2):143-153, (2011). doi:10.1016/j.ic.2010.11.026.

[33] Mike Fellows, Pinar Heggernes, Frances Rosamond, Christian Sloper, Jan Arne Telle. Finding k disjoint triangles in an arbitrary graph. WG 2004: 235-244.

[34] Henning Fernau, Fedor V. Fomin, Daniel Lokshtanov, Daniel Raible, Saket Saurabh, Yngve Villanger. Kernel(s) for problems with no kernel: on out-trees with many leaves. STACS 2009: 421-432. doi:10.1145/2344422.2344428.

[35] Lance Fortnow, Rahul Santhanam. Infeasibility of instance compression and succinct PCPs for NP. J. Comput. Syst. Sci., 77(1):91-106, (2011). doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2010.06.007.

[36] Jens Gramm, Jiong Guo, Falk Hüffner, Rolf Niedermeier. Data reduction and exact algorithms for clique cover. ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithmics 13 (2008). doi:10.1145/1412228.1412236.

[37] Jiong Guo, Rolf Niedermeier. Invitation to data reduction and problem kernelization. SIGACT News 38(1): 31-45 (2007). doi:10.1145/1233481.1233493.

[38] Gregory Gutin, Gabriele Muciaccia, Anders Yeo. (Non-)existence of polynomial kernels for the test cover problem. Inf. Process. Lett. 113(4): 123-126 (2013).

[39] Gregory Gutin, Igor Razgon, Eun Jung Kim. Minimum leaf out-branching and related problems. Theor. Comput. Sci. 410(45): 4571-4579 (2009).

[40] Shai Gutner, Michael Tarsi. Some results on (a:b)-choosability. Discrete Mathematics, 309(8): 2260-2270, (2009). doi:10.1016/j.disc.2008.04.061.

[41] Danny Hermelin, Stefan Kratsch, Karolina Soltys, Magnus Wahlström, Xi Wu. A completeness theory for polynomial (Turing) kernelization. Algorithmica 71(3): 702-730 (2015). doi:10.1007/s00453-014-9910-8.

[42] Danny Hermelin, Xi Wu. Weak compositions and their applications to polynomial lower bounds for kernelization. SODA 2012: 104-113. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973099.9.

[43] Ian Holyer. The NP-completeness of edge-coloring. SIAM J. Comput. 10(4): 718-720 (1981). doi:10.1137/0210055.

[44] Bart M. P. Jansen. Constrained bipartite vertex cover: the easy kernel is essentially tight. STACS 2016: 45:1-45:13.

[45] Bart M. P. Jansen. Turing kernelization for finding long paths and cycles in restricted graph classes. ESA 2014: 579-591. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-44777-2_48.

[46] Bart M. P. Jansen, Hans L. Bodlaender. Vertex cover kernelization revisited-upper and lower bounds for a refined parameter. Theory Comput. Syst. 53(2): 263-299 (2013). doi:10.1007/s00224-012-9393-4.

[47] Bart M. P. Jansen, Stefan Kratsch. On polynomial kernels for structural parameterizations of odd cycle transversal. IPEC 2011: 132-144. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-28050-4_11.

[48] Bart M. P. Jansen, Dániel Marx. Characterizing the easy-to-find subgraphs from the viewpoint of polynomial-time algorithms, kernels, and Turing kernels. SODA 2015: 616-629. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973730.42.

[49] Richard M. Karp, Richard J. Lipton. Some connections between nonuniform and uniform complexity classes. STOC 1980: 302-309. doi:10.1145/800141.804678.

[50] Johannes Köbler, Osamu Watanabe. New collapse consequences of NP having small circuits. SIAM J. Comput. 28(1): 311-324 (1998). doi:10.1137/s0097539795296206.

[51] J. Kratochvíl. Precoloring extension with fixed color bound. Acta Math. Univ. Comenian. (N.S.), 62(2): 139-153, (1993).

[52] Stefan Kratsch. Co-nondeterminism in compositions: a kernelization lower bound for a ramsey-type problem. ACM Trans. Algorithms 10(4): 19:1-19:16 (2014).

[53] Stefan Kratsch. Recent developments in kernelization: a survey. Bulletin of the EATCS 113 (2014).

[54] Stefan Kratsch, Geevarghese Philip, Saurabh Ray. Point line cover: the easy kernel is essentially tight. SODA 2014: 1596-1606. doi:10.1137/1.9781611973402.116.

[55] Stefan Kratsch, Marcin Pilipczuk, Ashutosh Rai, Venkatesh Raman. Kernel lower bounds using co-nondeterminism: finding induced hereditary subgraphs. TOCT 7(1): 4:1-4:18 (2014). doi:10.1145/2691321.

[56] Stefan Kratsch, Magnus Wahlström. Two edge modification problems without polynomial kernels. Discrete Optimization 10(3): 193-199 (2013).

[57] Richard E. Ladner. On the structure of polynomial time reducibility. J. ACM 22(1): 155-171 (1975). doi:10.1145/321864.321877.

[58] Wenjun Li, Jianxin Wang, Jianer Chen, Yixin Cao. A $2k$-vertex kernel for maximum internal spanning tree. WADS 2015: 495-505. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21840-3_41.

[59] Stephen R. Mahaney. Sparse complete sets of NP: solution of a conjecture of Berman and Hartmanis. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 25(2): 130-143 (1982).

[60] Dániel Marx, Valia Mitsou. Double-exponential and triple-exponential bounds for choosability problems parameterized by treewidth. ICALP 2016: 28:1-28:15.

[61] Nimrod Megiddo, Uzi Vishkin. On finding a minimum dominating set in a tournament. Theor. Comput. Sci. 61: 307-316 (1988). doi:10.1016/0304-3975(88)90131-4.

[62] Neeldhara Misra, Venkatesh Raman, Saket Saurabh. Lower bounds on kernelization. Discrete Optimization 8(1): 110-128 (2011). doi:10.1016/j.disopt.2010.10.001.

[63] Sarah E. Mocas. Separating exponential time classes from polynomial time classes. Ph.D. Thesis, Graduate School, College of Computer Science, Northeastern University, 1993.

[64] Egbert Mujuni, Frances A. Rosamond. Parameterized complexity of the clique partition problem. CATS 2008: 75-78.

[65] Assaf Natanzon, Ron Shamir, Roded Sharan. A polynomial approximation algorithm for the minimum fill-in problem. SIAM J. Comput. 30(4): 1067-1079 (2000).

[66] Mitsunori Ogiwara, Osamu Watanabe. On polynomial-time bounded truth-table reducibility of NP sets to sparse sets. SIAM J. Comput. 20(3): 471-483 (1991).

[67] James B. Orlin. Contentment in graph theory: Covering graphs with cliques. Indag. Math., 80: 406-424 (1977). doi:10.1016/1385-7258(77)90055-5.

[68] Guoqiang Pan, Moshe Y. Vardi. Fixed-parameter hierarchies inside PSPACE. LICS 2006: 27-36. doi:10.1109/lics.2006.25.

[69] Aduri Pavan, Alan L. Selman, Samik Sengupta, Vinodchandran N. Variyam. Poly logarithmic-round interactive proofs for coNP collapse the exponential hierarchy. Theor. Comput. Sci. 385(1-3): 167-178 (2007). doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2007.06.013.

[70] Alexander Schäfer, Christian Komusiewicz, Hannes Moser, Rolf Niedermeier. Parameterized computational complexity of finding small-diameter subgraphs. Optimization Letters, 6(5):883-891, (2012). doi:10.1007/s11590-011-0311-5.

[71] Uwe Schöning. Graph isomorphism is in the low hierarchy. J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 37(3): 312-323 (1988). doi:10.1016/0022-0000(88)90010-4.

[72] Stéphan Thomassé. A $4k^2$ kernel for feedback vertex set. ACM Trans. Algorithms 6(2) (2010). doi:10.1145/1721837.1721848.

[73] Stéphan Thomassé, Nicolas Trotignon, Kristina Vuskovi. A polynomial Turing-kernel for weighted independent set in bull-free graphs. WG 2014: 408-419.

[74] Magnus Wahlström. Abusing the Tutte matrix: an algebraic instance compression for the K-set-cycle problem. STACS 2013: 341-352.

[75] Chee-Keng Yap. Some consequences of non-uniform conditions on uniform classes. Theor. Comput. Sci. 26: 287-300 (1983). doi:10.1016/0304-3975(83)90020-8.



Figure 1: Weidong Luo received the B.S. degree in information security from Central South University, China, in 2013. Then he obtained his master degree in computer science from Central South University, China, in 2016. His research interests include kernelization, parameterized algorithm, structural complexity.